

1 DAVID H. KRAMER, State Bar No. 168452
2 COLLEEN BAL, State Bar no. 167637
3 LISA A. DAVIS, State Bar No. 179854
4 BART E. VOLKMER, State Bar No. 223732
5 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
6 Professional Corporation
650 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1050
Telephone: (650) 493-9300
Facsimile: (650) 565-5100
DKramer@wsgr.com

7 JONATHAN M. JACOBSON
8 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
9 Professional Corporation
10 12 East 49th Street, 30th Floor
New York, NY 10017-8203
Telephone: (212) 999-5800
Facsimile: (212) 999-5899
JJacobson@wsgr.com

11
12 Attorneys for Defendant
Google Inc.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF

2 Pursuant to Civil L.R. 7-11(b), defendant Google Inc. (“Google”) hereby submits this
3 opposition to plaintiff KinderStart.com LLC’s (“KinderStart”) Motion for Administrative Relief
4 to Exceed Page Length of Motion for Preliminary Injunction Filed May 26, 2006 (Doc. No. 19).
5 Google opposes KinderStart’s request for three reasons.

6 First, the request is untimely. If KinderStart wished to file a brief in excess of the page
7 limit required by Civil L.R. 7-2(b), it should have secured such relief *before* filing a brief in
8 contravention of the Local Rules. Indeed, plaintiff's counsel acknowledges that KinderStart
9 planned to file its preliminary injunction motion as early as May 2, 2006. Google should not be
10 put to the burden of responding to an oversized brief solely on KinderStart's whim.

11 Second, the request is procedurally improper. Civil L.R. 7-11(a) requires a Motion for
12 Administrative Relief to be accompanied “by either a stipulation under Civil L.R. 7-12 or by a
13 declaration that explains why a stipulation could not be obtained.” KinderStart’s motion is not
14 supported by a stipulation or a declaration.

15 Third, the request is substantively flawed. KinderStart has not made a showing that a
16 departure from the Local Rules is necessary to support its preliminary injunction motion which
17 rests on allegations that Google, a private actor, has violated KinderStart’s First Amendment
18 rights. Google’s previously filed Motion to Dismiss addressed this First Amendment claim in
19 less than five pages, and dealt with all nine of KinderStart’s claims for relief within the 25-page
20 limit of Civil L.R. 7-2(b).¹

²⁷ ¹ Contrary to KinderStart's assertion, Google's Motion to Dismiss did not exceed the 25 page limit of Civil L.R. 7-2(b) because tables preceding the motion are not included when calculating the length of a motion.

1 For these reasons, Google respectfully requests that the Court deny KinderStart's Motion
2 for Administrative Relief to exceed the applicable page limit and strike KinderStart's oversized
3 brief.

4 Dated: June 2, 2006

5
6 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
7 Professional Corporation
8

9 By: /s/ David H. Kramer
10 David H. Kramer
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Attorneys for Defendant
Google Inc.